

JOINT SESSION
COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES/INSURANCE
&
COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION/INFORMATION SYSTEMS

May 10, 2004

5:15 PM

Chairman Shea called the meeting to order in joint session.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Shea, Sysyn, DeVries, Garrity, Gatsas, Osborne, Porter,
Lopez

Absent: Alderman Forest

Messrs.: F. Rusczek, L. LaFreniere, P. Goucher, J. Hills, V. Lamberton,
F. Thomas, R. Ludwig, T. Lolicata

The Clerk noted that in the absence of Alderman Forest who is the Chairman of the Committee on Administration/Information Systems and this being a joint meeting, we would ask that the members of the Committee on Administration elect a Chairman Pro-Tem.

On motion of Alderman Porter, duly seconded by Alderman Gatsas it was voted to elect Alderman Lopez as the Chairman Pro-Tem.

Chairman Shea advised that the purpose of the joint session is discussion relative to restructuring proposals as follows:

- a) Health, Elderly Services, Youth Services

Mr. Fred Rusczek stated I wasn't sure if I was going to be presenting tonight so I didn't prepare anything formal. In the past a presentation that was made and an ordinance was recommended to be enacted. Generally speaking this is the fifth time now that the consolidation of Health, Youth Services and Elderly Services has been discussed by the Board of Aldermen. At any given point in time there are benefits that are different than times before. Today I will tell you that now that the Rines Center has been constructed some of the savings that were there from the physical sharing of space are not there anymore as they were in the last

presentation. Positions are all full now. We have an Office of Youth Services Director position that has been filled and that person is working. Now that they are at full staff we have been working with them to turn back over some of the functions that we helped them out on. For years, since the Office of Youth Services lost a half time account clerk back about five years or so ago the Health Department began taking over the books for the Office of Youth Services and helping them out on the financial side. Now that they are at full staff and the issue of consolidation was behind us, we have been working to transfer their financial stuff back to them as of July 1. At the moment, I would say that the savings aren't really in terms of new cash that can be gleaned from the consolidation process. The savings would come from improved efficiencies. As you are part of a larger organization you have strengths in the team that aren't there when you are a small unit like the Office of Youth Services or Elderly. That being said we have heard through the consolidations of these three that they wouldn't be compatible with the Health Department. The Office of Youth Services, for example, does much more with restitution and resolving kids issues where we are more on the prevention side. There would be a benefit from bringing the folks together but there isn't a cost savings today from eliminating positions or not filling vacant positions and consolidating in that fashion. Again, the Health Department can bring strengths in grant writing and many hands make small work at times and the larger the team I think there are some benefits but the proposals that were before you in the past that showed a savings from converted construction costs and filling the Director position for the Office of Youth Services in a different fashion is not the same as having to...we haven't reexamined to see if there is a way to perpetuate anything.

Chairman Shea stated I would accept a motion...

Alderman Garrity interjected Fred the potential savings before everybody went into the same building was about what, \$10,000.

Mr. Rusczek responded the last proposal was about \$30,000.

Alderman Garrity asked and that is not realized now because basically all of the departments are in the same building.

Mr. Rusczek answered the positions are full. The only way that you would realize any savings is to lay somebody off.

Alderman Garrity moved to receive and file. Alderman Sysyn duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Lopez asked if we receive and file this does that mean that it is going to come up next week or next month. If we are not going to have consolidation let's say we are not going to have consolidation of these three departments.

Chairman Shea asked what would you suggest.

Chairman Lopez stated I would ask the maker of the motion...

Alderman Garrity interjected I am receiving and filing Item a.

Alderman Lopez responded that is what I am talking about. Is it going to come up again next month? Why don't we just say...

Alderman Garrity interjected Alderman Guinta and myself did not use Elderly Services, Health and Youth Services in our budget number.

Chairman Lopez replied the point that I want to make is that there are lives out there and people who are affected. If we are saying receive and file let's say there will be no consolidation of Elderly Services and Youth Services with the Health Department. Would you agree to that?

Alderman Garrity responded yes.

Chairman Shea called for a vote. The motion carried with Alderman Gatsas being duly recorded in opposition.

b) Economic Development, Planning, Building

Mr. Leon LaFreniere stated as the Committee is aware there was a proposal that came before the Board last year that was worked through with the three departments and brought through both the Committee on Administration and the Committee on Human Resources and moved on to the full Board. There were actions taken that were consistent with the plan that we brought forward. Those included moving the Urban Ponds Restoration person an independent status to the Planning Department, moving the ZBA support functions from Planning to Building and taking some administrative steps to address the development application process including a process whereby the Building Department has a formal information link with the Fire Department for all plan reviews. There is a technical committee with the Planning Department whereby projects coming before the City that require land use board approvals are coordinated early on in the process. If the Committees are looking for us to move beyond what the Board

actually took votes on we would need some direction. We were not aware that there were additional steps that might be required or desired at this point.

Chairman Lopez stated I just want to bring to people's attention and maybe some of the members do remember but when this was presented as Economic Development, Planning and Building moving into Planning the Building Department was taken out of that whole equation and the only thing we ended up doing was having Economic Development going into the Planning Department. So the Building Department was excluded from consolidation. The original plan was for it to go into Planning but then it was agreed by the department heads and the Mayor that the crossover functions between the Planning and Building Department would not work. So there were votes taken for the record that the Building Department would not go into the Planning Department because it wasn't conducive to do so.

Mr. LaFreniere responded it was felt that we could address some of the efficiencies that were desired without consolidating and those were included in that proposal that I had mentioned. The ZBA support functions are now in the Building Department with the staff. We have one-stop procedures now for rezoning petitions so I think that part of the proposal has worked out quite successfully.

Alderman Porter stated having had experience as an Assessor dealing with Planning and Economic Development and the Building Department I think we have practically totally separate functions. I think we should be very careful even considering putting a Planning function in with a regulatory function. The job of a developer and I don't mean this cavalierly but I think that the job of Jane Hills or Bill Jabjiniak is to bring as many reasonable deals to the table as possible and then let the City do its due diligence through various staff members. I think when it comes to the Building Department it then becomes a regulatory issue rather than increasing the tax base. I just wanted to make that comment. I see three totally separate functions here and I don't believe that they would necessarily mix.

Alderman Gatsas asked can you tell me if the delivery of services would become better if the consolidation took place.

Mr. LaFreniere answered this was something that we did take a look at and determined that there weren't really any efficiencies to be gained in terms of delivery of services because the delivery of services are so distinct and separate from each other. Much of what the Building Department does in administering their function is field work and field inspections. We made the analogy before where the Building Department functions at the small end of the funnel where we have to make sure that all of the regulatory approvals are in place before it moves

forward in the process. So there are really different processes and different functions. We did see some efficiencies that could be gained by moving some of the overlaps between the two departments and that did take place as a result of the actions taken by the Board.

Alderman Gatsas asked can you tell me the overlap of services between Planning and Economic Development if there are any.

Ms. Pam Goucher responded I don't really see them that way. I think most people view the Economic Development as being the advocate for the development and trying to advocate for the City in general to encourage more businesses to locate and consider Manchester as a place to come and do business. The Planning Department has two tiers if you will. There are the special projects and the overall visionary component of the Planning Department but there is also the regulatory component. There always was that little bit of concern that if the Economic Development and Planning Department were merged there is the potential that someone would view the two as an advocate and that would take away from the potential advocacy or what you really want the Economic Development Office to do. I think what Leon said about the specific components like the issue with zoning and the Zoning Clerk being in our department and back and forth and the Urban Ponds Coordinator that we kind of felt questionable about supporting, bringing that person into the fold and at the time don't forget that at the time the proposal was brought forward Jay Taylor was contemplating retirement and the Administrative Assistant position in MEDO was vacant so some of the proposal was that perhaps the Administrative support staff in Planning could do some work with MEDO but that position has since been filled too. I think that if there were some additional consolidation to consider between the departments we would have to revisit this proposal much as Fred said about the Health Department. Some things have happened in the last year and we would have to revisit that.

Alderman Gatsas stated during your budget conversation when the Mayor was preparing his budget was their conversation about consolidation.

Ms. Goucher responded I will speak on behalf of Planning that if there were conversations between Bob and the Mayor regarding consolidation I am not aware of them.

Mr. LaFreniere stated not in the case of the Building Department.

Ms. Jane Hills stated I also don't know of any.

Alderman Guinta stated I understand that the Mayor is supportive of several consolidations and this being one of them so it does surprise me a little bit that

during the process of constructing the budget considering that it was included in his budget presentation but not in a budget number I am somewhat surprised that there was not a discussion with department heads relative to this issue. That being said, I look at this in a little bit of a different way. Consolidation sometimes has a negative connotation to it and it frightens people. The budget that was proposed by Alderman Garrity and myself included what was identified as consolidations because that is how it was proposed in the past. I think the preference here is to look at this as a reorganization or a restructuring to accomplish several things. First of all, some efficiencies, second to identify any duplicative services and combine them and third to prepare for what the City of Manchester expects services to be necessary for the future. In that, I look at this as a potential reorganization to properly utilize the people that we already have in place in the City. That being said, let's take building out of it. If there is no consensus to include Building, let's talk about Economic Development and Planning because to me they are essential and when I talk about economic development for the City of Manchester, I am also talking about the future and the planning of our City so I think the two go hand in hand. A couple of things that were mentioned. Number one, you said you would have to revisit this issue because things have happened since the last proposal. If you could expand on that a little bit and tell me specifically what has happened that would preclude a merge or a reorganization or a restructuring from being effective.

Ms. Goucher responded I think I would like to let Jane speak a little more about this but I guess one of the comments that I would have is that when the Mayor did present the budget we saw that within the budget he was looking to fund the Economic Development Director's position, which when this proposal was discussed it was not to replace Jay's position but take Jay's position and create two other positions. It would not be a Director but individuals who would be supportive of the economic development growth of Manchester. Maybe Jane wants to address that a little bit more but that is what I mean about how things changed a little bit. The other aspect was that the Administrative Assistant in MEDO had left and there was talk for some time about whether or not to fund it and I believe Jane had temporary help for some time because there was always the issue that maybe we could take some of the administrative staff from Planning and try to cover it. Also it wasn't certain that the zoning clerk would go to Building and there was that extra administrative staff person within Planning in addition to the other administrative staff in Planning who could all provide coverage. One of those administrative staff people from Planning has now gone to Building and in the interim time period I believe MEDO has hired a permanent administrative assistant. Those are some of the issues that seem to have changed from when this proposal was advanced but that is what the talk was. It is not that it isn't something that could be examined, it is just that some of those elements have changed from a year or a year and a half ago.

Chairman Shea stated if we are separating I believe in the minds of all of us the Building Department from the Planning and Economic Development Departments I would entertain a motion to remove this particular aspect from the discussion unless people feel otherwise and get the Economic Development and Planning Departments up. I am not sure...

Alderman Lopez moved to remove the Building Department from the consolidation discussion and not have them combined with the Planning Department. Alderman DeVries duly seconded the motion. Chairman Shea called for a vote. The motion carried with Alderman Gatsas being duly recorded in opposition.

Chairman Shea stated I would like to have the Economic Development people along with the Planning Department...is Bob MacKenzie here.

Ms. Goucher responded no. I just found out at 4:30 PM today that something came up and he asked me to be here. I don't know if he is going to make it back for this Committee meeting or not.

Chairman Shea asked are you going to represent him.

Ms. Goucher answered well I asked Mr. MacKenzie what this meeting was intended to do tonight and he didn't know that there was a presentation or anything specific that the Board was looking for so I will do the best I can to answer questions. I was not aware of exactly what the Board was looking for tonight.

Alderman DeVries stated the merger as originally intended was Economic Development folding into the Planning Department and it would have removed the department head or Economic Development Director and replaced him with two staff people if I understand correctly. There were going to be four separate divisions set-up. Can you address the cost savings if that plan was enacted?

Ms. Goucher responded I don't know if Jane is but I am not prepared to address any of the specifics with cost savings. I guess the only other note that I would want to make sure that the Board is aware of is if you look at some of the charts that were part of the original proposal there were some specifics of how the coordination with the review criteria and Leon addressed it by saying that he has brought the Fire Department into the fold a little bit more as we have brought the development review back and forth between the departments a little more than what was in existence prior.

Alderman DeVries stated that is part of the review committee that is in fact already taking place. We did form that...the Fire Department at least.

Ms. Goucher responded I think I would need to let Jane answer for the specifics in MEDO.

Ms. Hills stated I think when this proposal was put forth it was over a year ago and our thought was that in terms of cost savings we didn't anticipate any savings in the immediate future. We intended to keep the budgets for the departments the same but because the cost would be shifted from the Director's position in MEDO to pay for two staff level positions we would be able to provide more services for the same amount of money. There also was some suggestion in the proposal as I recall that the administrative assistant position in MEDO, which was vacant, that some of the funds for that would be used to go towards the two Economic Development staff people. That position has now been filled so that makes it a little more difficult to do.

Alderman DeVries stated certainly over the course of the last year in my opinion at least we have been extremely lucky that we have survived without filling that position and I think that was a mistake a year ago that I was a party to and I regret. We have heard from or at least I have heard from the Chamber of Commerce as well as MDC to be sure that we recognize our need to continue our efforts for economic development in this City. Referencing the replacement as it was previously with the Director who was the advocate for the City, can you detail for me the two staff individuals that would be replacing...would that be filling the same role or...I realize that there is an enhancement of services that could be recognized but I am just wondering as far as advocacy.

Ms. Hills responded the two professional staff positions in the Economic Development Office, mine and the Director's position with the exception of a few specialized program we pretty much are doing the same thing. There were a certain number of things that had to be done for the department so it is not that the Assistant does one job and the Director does another. As I recall and I also did not know that I was going to be asked to make a presentation this evening but there was some division that we had come up with for those positions – who would cover which areas but I don't think we foresaw any new programs. We simply thought that there would be enough bodies available to take care of what needed to be done. Does that answer your question?

Alderman DeVries replied it does. A final comment if I might. It would appear to me that there is additional information that we should at least be acquiring as we continue to look at the Economic Development Office. I know that there has been discussion regarding how that position should be reorganized within the

department or folded into another. I would just caution this Committee regarding a hasty decision this evening. I think there are other proposals or thoughts that we should be hearing about.

Chairman Lopez stated if I may bring people up to date in reference to some communication because last December Jane Hills put a committee together and asked me to sit in on it because I was the HR Chairman at that time and I want to make sure that everyone understands that the problem we had with this particular issue is that some Aldermen didn't want to put the Economic Development division into Planning and some did. I think the end conclusion after meeting with various people who sat down and discussed this issue it was determined that we needed somebody in the City that was either the Coordinator or move into the Economic Development Group that was proposed under the merger of Economic Development into Planning. I think the consensus that I got from some of the Aldermen was that they wanted to have a Coordinator, not another director of three people. We needed a chief coordinator in that particular office. We needed that individual to be hired and come in and take over that office and come back and tell us exactly how he is going to organize. I refer to a letter of January 30 that I submitted to the Mayor and various people and I will ask the HR Director to comment on it in a few minutes but it laid out a complete plan as far as the job description, the approval from the HR Committee, money to be put into the Mayor's budget, interviews of the candidates and so on. The whole program was spelled out. In looking at the budget I now see that there is only \$55,000 added to that particular division. I am a little leery of saying that we are going to approve \$55,000 and they are going to hire another director. I think the shortchange that the Board of Aldermen get is that we do not have somebody coming in to the Board with concrete ideas. We do have a person that is funded by grant money as my communication indicated and I can get the City Clerk to give everybody another copy of it but the intent was that the person that is being paid by the grant money now would stay there until the Coordinator came in. If we, as Aldermen, cannot make a decision as to having a Coordinator I surely agree with Alderman Guinta that something has to be done in the economic area as far as having somebody in charge of economic development in the City whether that be putting it in the Planning Department or making a separate Economic Development group. Some of the things that the economic development people are responsible for are planning, financing, retention, recruitment, marketing, public relations, administration and development. Surely we are not getting that today. I just want to bring that to the people's attention here so as we move forward if we are going to hire somebody I think it has to be, in my viewpoint anyway, if we are going to keep an Economic Division then it has to be a complete coordinator for the City that is in charge of Destination Manchester. The Destination Manchester Coordinator reports to the Mayor instead of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen and I disagree with that. We are the policy makers. We need to have the people

come and tell us what is going on. If it please you, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the HR Director for her input.

Ms. Virginia Lamberton stated at this point my input was to develop a cost specification that would combine some of Alderman Lopez's ideas or visions along with what existed under MEDO and that was done in January. I don't believe anything happened from that point forward.

Alderman Guinta asked Ginny can you just expand upon that a little bit. Was that classification based on the assumption that there would be a consolidation of the two departments?

Ms. Lamberton answered I don't believe so. I believe it was to increase the coordination of all kinds of development in the City by having MEDO under it and Destination Manchester but also provide continuity over the years for when new Mayors and new Aldermen came and went so there was some history there. Some of the duties were taken from the class specification that existed years ago of a job title of City Coordinator.

Alderman Guinta asked so in your opinion then it would make sense that before we, as a City, hire an Economic Development Director or whatever position that is that it would make sense to make the determination as a Board as to whether we are going to try to restructure these two departments.

Ms. Lamberton answered I would think so and I would think if you are heading towards a City Coordinator or even filling the former MEDO Director's job you might want to look at the class specification and see what it says and see if that is what you want to have as duties for that position or positions.

Alderman Guinta asked can these two Committees move forward with a reorganization and during a parallel process come up with that specification.

Ms. Lamberton answered certainly.

Alderman Guinta stated if you look at a couple of the projects, a couple of the large projects that have happened or occurred in the City over the last year and a half I think most people would look at the riverfront development project and the Bridge and Elm Street project. In my opinion and not only because they are downtown but those projects are going to have a massive effect on not only the City but the region but we need to have a very strong position as a City with respect to economic development and planning. I think most people would agree that if you want to maximize as a City not only what you own as a City but maximize the efforts of redevelopment because that is the next phase of

development in our City is going to be redevelopment, we need to have a strong voice when it comes to the planning phase and the economic development phase. I think and I will just give you an example. If a developer right now wants to develop in this City, I think based on the recent history the City presents challenges that it doesn't want to present to those future developers. We would like to, as a City, entice development and we also would like to be able to make sure that that development happens or that it is in keeping with what the Board of Mayor and Aldermen see as appropriate for the future of our City and we do that through election. I think from a City standpoint and I would agree with Alderman Lopez that we absolutely need to have one voice. This City needs to have one voice when trying to build the future of our City and that is through economic development and planning. There is no question. You can develop without a plan. To me they seem to go hand in hand. If there is not going to be a dollar savings today or immediately, I think what you are going to see are some financial savings over time and also greater consistency with projects. We look at the Bridge and Elm Street project and would not that have occurred quicker if the City was in a better situation to advocate during that process. Maybe the answer is yes and maybe the answer is no but my preference would be for the City to have an advocate that has the ability to represent us on behalf of economic development and planning. I think you are also going to see greater and more effective communication. If a developer comes in I know that they have questions with respect to parcels of land and planning phases of that land. It makes a lot of sense to put those two together. I think if the two Committees want to vote to move forward in a reorganization or consolidation I think it sounds like you can do that tonight, work with HR, the Mayor's Office and the affected departments to come up with the appropriate personnel that would fill out that department but I think the vote needs to happen sooner rather than later because if you don't and then you hire an Economic Development Director you have lost the ability to make some changes as this Board sees fit. I certainly would hope that there is some action taken today and it is certainly going to require this Board and some of the departments and the Mayor's Office to work pretty quickly but I think we can do it.

Alderman Porter stated I would like to have some more discussion. I think Ms. Lamberton hit it right on the head. We have to figure out what we want an economic developer to do. I agree with Alderman Guinta in that we need a strong voice for economic development but I foresee a danger that the economic development person becomes either controlled by the Planning Director or vice versa and I think they are two separate entities. I think it is important to understand that we need an aggressive economic developer who has the tools and the funds to be able to go out and make an attempt to create opportunities and to create interest in the City. It is one thing to have developers come into the City and then meetings are established and so forth but I think it is another to have a

person aggressively out in the marketplace lassoing if you will developers to come in. At that point, I think that is where the planning function can come in. Is it feasible? Is it doable? Is it legal? I don't think that the planning function should be necessarily geared towards increasing our tax base but rather seeing that whatever development is done is done in conformity with zoning regulations and planning regulations and so forth. I just want to caution the Committees again to be careful when you want to mix a non-regulatory department with a regulatory department. I think that there should be something done to have a strong voice as Alderman Guinta said but as Ms. Lamberton said let's find out what it is that we would like an economic developer to do and then take it from there.

Alderman DeVries stated I have a couple of questions. Pam, can you expand on the conflict that might be had with a regulatory agency becoming also the advocate for the City and economic development?

Ms. Goucher responded the concern that sometimes comes up is that as an economic development advocate your job really is to try to get the businesses in, track them, and draw them from other communities much like the Chamber does and tell them that the community is a great place to come on board. That person may not have all of the facts about what you can or can't do relative to zoning or specific regulatory measures within the subdivision site plan regulations for example. That doesn't mean that they can't be amended through the Board of Mayor and Aldermen process but I think you just have to be careful that you don't get caught up in the desire so much to get something in that the normal steps that would take place take a back seat if you will. They have to go hand in hand. If you bring the discussion in early enough I think you can work through the issues but sometimes there is an advocate that wants something to happen and the person is in charge of making sure that you are complying with your own by-laws as well as the state statutes and you have to make sure that the balance is there. That is I think where the issue comes up. I am not saying that it can't be accomplished if you work at it early enough in a project.

Alderman DeVries stated could you expand on that because the Planning staff also is an adjunct to the Planning Board that has the ultimate regulatory decision. Now is that going to place Planning in a direct conflict if one of their staff members is now advocating for something to happen that may be difficult for the Planning Board and thus reflects back on Planning staff?

Ms. Goucher responded I don't know if it is at that point in time that the conflict might arise. I don't think that the Planning staff would bring something to the Planning Board that didn't meet the intent of our regulations. I think that where you have to be careful is that early on in the process the path doesn't get taken or it gets almost so far down the track that it is hard to back up and say wait a minute

we have some issues that we have to look at. That, I think, is the danger. You have to make sure that if they are going to kind of work as one that they work as one early on but that is where you potentially could have someone who is really advocating for something - an economic development and what that would bring to the community and how much taxes that would bring in to the City and they forgot that it wasn't zoned properly and then you say well okay we will just rezone it and you kind of look at how the zoning works and say well maybe that is not the best thing. Are we going to want at the Planning Department to advocate for the change in zoning to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen or does that go against our planning sense that that particular zone should not be changed to accommodate this particular zoning. I think that is where you have to be careful.

Alderman DeVries stated since this particular proposal came before us about a year ago there have been a couple of changes. One being as already mentioned the investigation of the City Coordinator position or restaffing of the Economic Development Director. That needs to be flushed out and more thoroughly reviewed by both of these Committees. Also, if I recollect there is pending a couple of new positions that might be grant funded or CDBG funded at the Planning Department for a long-range planner position...I just think we need to ask the Planning Director to reconsider how that might fit into the chart for the scope of the different divisions that he was laying out a year ago because I think there might be some overlap with the community planning and some of those other positions that he had hoped would be funded for this year.

Ms. Goucher responded right. One of them was the neighborhood planner and the other one was titled special projects planner. Now whether or not you view the special projects planner as someone more akin to economic development or revitalization I don't know. I don't know specifically what Mr. MacKenzie was talking about originally but I think that is what you are saying that perhaps if there was some discussion to take place regarding overall staffing that the positions that individual planners may have would have to be reviewed.

Alderman DeVries replied absolutely. What I am saying is that I would like to get the feedback from the Planning Director as to how those positions would fit into the organizational chart and I would also like to hear more about the progress that Alderman Lopez has made with the City Coordinator's position as a separate entity free-standing within the Economic Development Division because I really don't feel that has been fully studied to try to make a decision as to which way we want to go.

Alderman Roy stated while I agree with a number of things that have been said in this room I stand here in a pretty interesting position because I brought a developer to City Hall today and we met with Planning, Building and the Destination

Manchester Coordinator so I have inside knowledge as to how those work and how they work together when things are brought forward. One of the things I would like to address are a couple of questions for Jane and then a statement. In the Manchester Economic Development Office how many people are there?

Ms. Hills responded there are two.

Alderman Roy asked yourself and...

Ms. Hills interjected the administrative assistant.

Alderman Roy stated while I commend you for keeping everything together a number of times today we talked about a strong voice here at City Hall and this is the statement part. As we look at increasing our tax base in the City of Manchester we have two people that fall under the Economic Development Office and I will include Bill Jabjiniak who works for the Mayor's Office into the economic development package that we put forward. When we put out a voice to the business community that we have a Deputy Director, an employee of the Mayor's Office and an Assistant as our entire Economic Development team our sales force for the City when it comes to increasing our tax base, that speaks volumes. It doesn't come out as a strong voice. It speaks volumes as to what we are doing or what we are lacking in in putting our best foot forward. As we go forward if we really want to get serious about increasing our tax base we have to be serious about putting people on the ground level and sales force side of selling Manchester and creating economic development no matter who they report to, whether it is Planning or the Economic Development Department because the business community and the developers out there see this and I am sure Skip is here from MDC and he can attest to this and Chamber members have approached me on it as well as fellow realtors so we need to speak in volumes not just with a strong voice.

Alderman Sysyn stated I agree that we should have the Economic Development Director separate from the Planning Department.

Chairman Shea asked are you making a motion to separate...

Alderman Sysyn interjected I am but could I just ask Deputy City Clerk Johnson to step up for a minute because she used to be the City Coordinator at one time and she had a couple of comments.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated I guess I would open up by saying that a lot of the discussion tonight is, I think, good and healthy discussion and a lot of this discussion took place in 1991, which is when I was sitting in the City

Coordinator's position and I would have to say probably the only person that ever worked in City Hall that ever eliminated my own job in submitting a proposal to the Board because I felt strongly about the structure at the time. At that time, if you recall, some of you might recall that the CIP portion of the Planning Department was an entity of itself and the City Coordinator was in charge of that portion. The advantage of that at the time was that the City Coordinator was not reporting to another department head or to the Mayor but was reporting to the Board directly. Now with the Charter changes obviously department heads report to the Mayor as well as to the Board. There is a working relationship there for both sides but I guess I would have to say that in any coordination or any combinations that you do, that position needs to be a strong position and it needs to be a strong position for a couple of reasons. One is that it has to have the ability to bring department heads together and if that person says I need to call a meeting of whatever departments and there may be as many as five or six that they may need to coordinate with but they need to have that respect and authority to do that. It is irregardless. If you are reporting to the Planning Director it is pretty hard to argue with them just as if you are directly reporting to the Mayor within the Mayor's Office it is probably a little harder to come to the Board and give a different presentation than what the Mayor wants. I had the wonderful experience of doing that a couple of times and I can tell you it is not easy but that is the major focus and consideration. I think you are right about a City Coordinator. I think that the Finance Office and the Highway Department and to some extent Bill Jabjiniak and a bunch of your department heads have tried to pick up that slack. I think it is obvious that it has been missing in a couple of the big projects that have come up and baseball is the most recent one obviously that you have experienced but over the last 10 years there were several times that if you had had a City Coordinator things would have been much easier and much better, both on the development side and on the City side. I can understand what Alderman Roy was saying about a developer coming in and seeing three different departments at once but that is part of the strength of the City to have a City Coordinator say these five departments are going to help you work through this. You are saying something. It doesn't matter that you only have three people in an office. It is what does that office have behind it and who is standing behind it and how much strength you have.

Chairman Shea stated right now it is separate and the explanation you have given is that you would obviously recommend that it be kept separate. In other words that Economic Development be kept separate from Planning because of the distinct nature of what one has to do vis a vie what the other has to do.

Deputy Clerk Johnson responded I think that needs to be determined based on how you are structuring it and what you want out of that City Coordinator. There are some real strengths to that though I guess I would have to say. That is not to say

that that office can't encompass other things either and you may want to look at the whole picture. There may be other things that could come under there instead of other places.

Chairman Shea stated I know we have a couple of other departments here and we could discuss this but does anyone have a motion.

Alderman Sysyn moved to keep the Economic Development Office separate from the Planning Department.

Alderman DeVries stated I will second the motion if I can make an amendment. I would like to continue the research of the City Coordinator position that was offered up in January and to have that report come back to the Board for further evaluation. So, we are maintaining the two departments as separate and distinct agencies and continuing, before we fill the MEDO Director position, to look at the City Coordinator position.

Alderman Sysyn asked are you talking about filling the Economic Development Director position.

Alderman DeVries answered no. Maybe we can make them as two separate motions. I will withdraw my amendment and second Alderman Sysyn's motion.

Chairman Shea asked so the motion is to keep the Economic Development Office separate from the Planning Department. I will call for a vote. The motion carried with Aldermen Gatsas and Garrity being duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman DeVries stated I would like to request that the City Coordinator position that was brought forward in January be researched and have a report back to see how we would like to staff the opening in the Economic Development Office.

Chairman Lopez stated in reference to the January 30 letter and I would ask the City Clerk to get that out to all of the Aldermen but for the record there were some items in there as we move along in this process on having a City Coordinator. I was recommending that a Coordinator/Economic Development Officer be created and until such person is hired the office will remain the same. After the hiring of such a Coordinator all duties of the Destination Manchester Coordinator will come under the control of the City Coordinator. The HR Director is to prepare a job description and the CDBG funds are to stay in MEDO for use by the City Coordinator. That is all in the letter that was accepted by Seth at that time, the Mayor's Assistant. I just want to remind everybody here that there is only \$55,000 in that budget at the present time so we will have to address that but I do

agree that something needs to be done in a concrete way so that the City Coordinator is in charge of that division.

c) Parks, Traffic, Highway.

Chairman Shea asked Frank Thomas, Ron Ludwig and Tom Lolicata to come forward.

Mr. Frank Thomas stated for the record I would like to start off by saying that no matter what you heard I am not trying to build an empire through consolidations. In fact, I don't have much of a desire to take these two departments. I would be taking on two departments that don't want to be consolidated. I have also heard rumors that with consolidation existing employees would most likely be grandfathered into the operation and maintain their positions and that they would be maintaining their existing salaries but yet it has also been stated that no department head receiving a consolidated department will receive any additional compensation as a result of consolidations. If this is true a consolidated employee will maintain their salaries with fewer responsibilities but yet the department head receiving the consolidated departments will assume more responsibilities without any additional compensation. Why would any department head desire to have departments consolidated under them? In my opinion the process, if true, is destined to fail before it even starts. Now having said all of that, I have always done what I have been directed to do. If consolidations move forward I will do everything in my power to make them work. I have a proven record of successfully consolidating new operations under the Public Works Department. As an example, the Building Maintenance Division coming in under Public Works. I believe that if you examine this consolidation you will find that the employees have improved morale and that we are doing more with the same total resources. This should be the goal of consolidation – improved services not just saving a buck. Over a year ago I asked Barbara Connor...Barbara Connor as you know has been with Building Maintenance from Day 1 and I asked her to summarize her views on consolidation with Public Works. I do have a draft response to my request from Barbara Connor and I will let the City Clerk pass it out. You can read it at your leisure. Does consolidation make sense? Yes. I believe that through consolidation you will have improved efficiencies and better utilization of limited resources. Does having 20+ department heads reporting to the Mayor, our CEO, make sense? No. Responsibility and accountability are spread out over too many agencies. Even the President of the United States has only one cabinet. September 11 has shown that there is a need to improve homeland security to have one agency that is responsible for all of those activities. Here it does make sense to tighten up this line of responsibilities. Do other municipalities have these same operations under one department? Yes. Nashua does, Concord does, and Portsmouth does. I realize that we all are a little different

and there are little tweaks here and there but basically speaking the three major municipalities in the state do have these functions under them. In the case of Portsmouth, DPW maintains the parks but there is a separate entity that operates the park system. Nashua doesn't have cemeteries. In your agenda you have a copy of my proposed consolidation plan that was prepared in the fall of 2002. It defines both short term and long term goals. Most of the proposals are still valid while a few have to be modified a little bit. Keep in mind as I noted in this proposal that this was a working document and a starting point. The merits of any proposed change can be debated back and forth. I am sure my colleague sitting to my right will give you numerous specific reasons why my assumptions are wrong and why it can't be done or why it shouldn't be done. I am saying that it can be done and there will be benefits to the City in the long run. Even though I have defined specific recommendations in that proposal, if consolidation was to move forward I would recommend that after consolidation take place that over the next year we define a restructuring of the operation and implement proposals because clearly recommendations and efficiencies and cost savings don't surface immediately. Now I could go into more detail defining the specifics in the proposal but they are in your agenda and I know we are running out of time. I believe that the other departments would like to speak and if you have any questions I would be happy to answer them.

Chairman Shea stated first of all I would like the other departments to speak to be fair and then questions could be asked.

Mr. Ron Ludwig stated effectively I think that everything Frank said has been truthful and upfront but I would like to read for the record a letter that we put on the front portion of our proposal as it relates to the consolidation. This is a little dated now so bear with me but I think in general a lot of the remarks remain the same:

“Dear Board Members:

This past summer Mayor Baines issued a directive to review the consolidation of Parks, Recreation & Cemeteries and Traffic Departments into the Public Works Department. I attended a meeting with the Mayor, Alderman O'Neil, Director of Public Works, Frank Thomas and the Director of Traffic, Tom Lolicata. At this meeting we were instructed to conduct additional meetings between the parties in an effort to bring forward a plan that would consolidate the department. On August 8, 2002, the department heads met at the DPW office with additional staff members from each department. At this meeting I provided the information requested of me by Frank. The information included the department's organization chart, seniority list, and list of all full time employees

including positions and pay grades. They also provided additional information to job functions of our administrative staff. Subsequent to this meeting Mr. Thomas arranged for two of the DPW Business Service Officers of which he has three, to meet with the Parks, Recreation & Cemetery Department Business Service Officer. We have one. Additional members of the Parks, Recreation & Cemetery staff were interviewed and asked to explain their job functions. After a cursory review the next communication received from the Department of Public Works was on September 23 it included a semi-final report prepared by Frank. No additional meetings were ever conducted between the parties to discuss or verify the accuracy of the report supplied to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. Mr. Thomas clearly states that in his September 18, 2002 letter to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen that recommendations contained in the proposal are solely made from his office. The consolidation report was prepared in a partial and bias manner. A complete review and analysis of each department and their operations was never conducted. Instead the report only looks at two of the departments – Parks, Recreation and Cemetery and Traffic. There is no review of the Public Works Department management staff and support services to determine ways of consolidation this operation to save money. Furthermore, the proposed consolidation does not consider the complexity of the Manchester Parks, Recreation & Cemetery Department and its diverse operation. A comparison is made in the report to Nashua where parks maintenance and recreation programs were merged into their Public Works Department. However, this is a poor example to use since Nashua has far fewer facilities than Manchester, no golf courses or ice arenas or ski areas. The cemeteries are managed separately and school grounds and athletic fields are maintained by their School District. Throughout New England and the country, the larger and more progressive cities include a distinct Parks & Recreation Department within their governmental structure. These cities care about the quality of the life issues, recreational opportunities and the community parks and open space. In my opinion, Manchester needs to maintain a separate department and professional staff that focus on these issues if they wish to be competitive in attracting business while providing their residents with quality parks and recreation facilities.”

I did have a brief Powerpoint presentation, which I supplied to members of the Board. Unfortunately the camera tonight is not working. That would have made the graphic a little bit better. I am forced by virtue of the breakdown in equipment to just flip through it quickly because I know that time is of the essence and I know that Mr. Lolicata would like to have some input into this as well. With that in mind, I will flip through. In response to the proposal that was prepared by Frank Thomas, I have some comments. On Page 2, Parks, Recreation &

Cemeteries is not supported by the following groups: Parks, Recreation & Cemetery Commission, the Parks, Recreation & Cemetery Department, Parks Professionals and Support Organizations, which is our national organization and the former Parks Superintendent himself, Clem Lemire, who spent well over 35 years in the profession. In our opinion, the citizens of Manchester including families, students and volunteers. I think one of the things we want to understand is that the Parks Department isn't just about cutting grass and plowing snow. It is about people. We serve youth. We serve adults. We serve people who want to use the facilities in Manchester. It is not just about static things like mowing grass and if I hear that anymore I may become ill because that is really not what we do. The fact of the matter is that the Parks Department has gone through a decade of change, a decade of change since I have been here. In 1993, Parks and Recreation was merged with the Cemetery Department. In 1995, the Recreation Enterprise was established to make half of our operation revenue producing, which it always was, however, this took another look at trying to make us act more businesslike and not charge enough people to make money as a business if that makes any sense but it has worked for us and I will say that. In 1996, the buzzword then was privatization. It is consolidation now but then it was privatization. We have done a lot of privatization and some of that has worked and it has actually been pretty good. However, we took it upon ourselves to reorganize the complete Parks Department administration. That means payroll and how we were going to operate our enterprise with a Business Service Officer – all of these items were supported by the Yarger Decker study in 1999. It said a department can't be in existence without a Deputy Director of this size. It just can't happen. Today we believe the Parks and Recreation administration is efficient and effective. Our vision statement as we have supplied in the past is to be a progressive agency that meets the recreational and leisure needs of residents while complementing the City's economic and redevelopment goals. Our mission statement is to provide quality recreational facilities and programs that serve the public and enhance the quality of life. You can see on the slide where I wanted to show Gill Stadium, Pine Grove Cemetery and Veteran's Park that it just shows the complexity of our operations. We do things from putting up the tent structure in Veteran's Park and running most of the programs that are had there in conjunction with Intown who does assist in some degree...Gill Stadium is a semi-professional ballpark yet we also maintain the Pine Grove Cemetery. I have supplied you with an organizational chart, which shows you the exact number of full-time people that are in our complement. It also adds up across the line there of six full-time people in our administrative services, a breakdown for parks and cemeteries, how many people are in the recreation enterprise and I guess that is self-explanatory. The big item that I want to call to your attention is that we work with part-time people exclusively. This is not always easy. It means a lot of training and a lot of retraining and it means that we spend an awful lot of time at that game. A majority of those people are used at places like our pools – 35 to 38 lifeguards in a

season, our ski area with the tubing park – another 30 to 35 people in season, our youth recreation activities Fun in the Sun Program, which services 600 children in three different locations in the summer with a staff of about 30 to 35 people. So we are a huge, diverse organization. You can see the next slide where we show our facilities – we just wanted to show you that we are made up of downtown parks, neighborhood parks, 20 school parks and city-wide parks, trails, golf course, sports stadium, ice arenas, ski area, swimming pools, bathing beach, burial and cemeteries and historic cemeteries. We have about 1,200 acres of parkland to maintain, 66 parks, 92 athletic fields and 49 recreation courts. 10 recreational facilities, which include our golf course, ski area, two ice arenas, four swimming pools and a beach. 275 acres at the Pine Grove Cemetery alone, of which 175 are now developed. A 20 acre Valley Cemetery, 7 historic cemeteries, which most people don't even know exist, 12 miles of trails and 55,000 street trees to maintain. Some of the adult programs that you may not be aware of that we also handle in our department are "Walk for Your Health", the dart program, and the bowling league. We have youth programs like "Fun in the Sun", and after school programs at Beech and Wilson School, the youth center, parades – we assist with the Christmas Parade, the St. Patrick's Day Parade, the Fire Prevention Parade, and the Veteran's Day Parade. Community events – we put on the Fourth of July fireworks. We do festivals, concerts, walk-a-thons, and road races. Volunteer efforts. We are involved in Adopt-A-Block, park and urban ponds clean up, rails to trails, and Eagle Scouts are calling us daily to assist with their projects. This is about people, not about asphalt curbing and grass. Partnerships that we have are with Friends of the Valley Street Cemetery, Intown Manchester and UNH Cooperative Services. The next slide that you can flip through quickly is we want to point out that more of your progressive larger cities similar in size to ours have stand-alone parks departments. We looked at about 10 departments. Nashua is included in our comparison. The only two cities we could find out of that list, which includes Portland, Burlington, Boston, Lowell, Springfield, Worcester and Providence that don't have stand-alone departments although I just heard another one, Portsmouth, to my left, were Hartford, CT and Nashua and they really don't compare to the kind of recreational facilities we have in this City. There is no one that has a ski area. We are probably one of two municipal ski areas in the country. No one really lines up and if we look at the Nashua Parks Department you see that they still have a stand-alone cemetery department because their cemetery is important to them and that is the way they determined to run it. In Hartford, CT their recreation division is not a part of their DPW, it is a part of the Division of Human Services. Again, you can see on the slide and unfortunately people at home can't see it but some of the nice things that the department has done and I think the department has done an excellent job at building new parks as the Board has been gracious enough to allow funds. You can see a picture of the kids in line here at McIntyre Ski Area, which came on line in 1971 and still is in great shape today. The next slide really kind of shows us and I had asked our Business

Services Officer to speak to this but I am going to walk you through it because I think it is an important slide and there isn't room for him to be up here and we can't show it to you on a screen. Basically what it says is that 60% of our administration is funded in the Enterprise and 40% of our administration is funded in the general fund. We have about an \$11.3 million operating and capital budget and we have about a \$6.6 million overall budget, which involves Enterprise. If you back out the Enterprise and some trust funds and look at our general fund budget our operating costs are about \$2.6 million overall of that \$6 million, which represents about \$24.79 for each person in the City to recreate. The next slide shows you some of our funding sources and it shows you that we are complex and that is what we are trying to show you here in terms of no we are not the largest budget in the City but we are the most complex in terms of the way we are structured. We have the Parks, Recreation Enterprise and Cemetery who receive dollars from special revenue accounts, capital bonds, the general fund, user fees and trust funds. So it is not just keeping tabs on money out of the guard walk so to speak where you would be all general fund money and you put some money and take it out. It is a very complicated budgeting system for a small department. Parks funding sources – you can see that the parks receive money from special revenue, capital bonds and general funds. The recreation and recreation enterprise receive funds from...recreation receives funds from special revenue, capital bonds and the general fund and recreation enterprise gets funds from user fees, capital bonds and special revenue. Cemetery funding sources are from trust funds, the general fund, capital bonds and special revenues. The other shows you something else that is unique to Manchester on how we have been asked over the years to interact with our School District. You can see how Parks, Recreation and Cemetery plus Administration all interact with the School District. Parks is doing school maintenance work, fencing, and playground equipment in the school yards, some plowing and all of their athletic field maintenance. The Recreation Department services the School District by maintaining Gill Stadium, the two ice arenas for their hockey teams, the ski area for their ski team and golf for their golf teams. At the Cemetery Department they are asked to participate in our plowing. Our people could no longer handle the entire complement of schools as we built them out. Our responsibilities became a little bit larger. The Cemetery handles the plowing responsibilities in the southern tier. It works out quite nicely. Administration is doing billing, work orders, projects and planning. Again you can see on that slide, which unfortunately the people can't see at home some of the better projects we have done – the West Memorial field...if we didn't have West Memorial field this year with Gill Stadium being out of service and Memorial under construction I think we would be playing all of our games in Londonderry. You can see the department has done landscaping around places like Northwest Elementary School. Again, we are just a diverse department. We believe that in summary the consolidation proposal is detrimental to the Parks and Recreation Department. It involves or called for originally two immediate lay-offs, two

immediate position downgrades, four additional positions eliminated and a drastic reduction in service. The next slide shows you how that 60/40 split is accomplished. If you take the 60/40 split for the recommended immediate savings with two lay-offs, it generates about \$60,000 in savings. Probable savings if the Board decided to move this process through attrition would be about \$6,119. In conclusion this proposal is not in the best interest of Manchester. It has less emphasis on parks, open space and urban forestry, recreational programs, school athletics, cemetery services and maintenance and that is it. I would just like to say a couple of things and then I will turn the rest of the time over to Tom Lolicata. I apologize for taking the time but it is an extremely important issue. We were consolidated with the Cemetery Department several years ago. We lost a director. That is fine. We lost an assistant director. That is fine. We turned a foreman into a working type foreman and we put someone who looks good and is always clean in a nice shirt to deal with the funeral directors. If he is out the girl in the office takes those people out there. So we are making it work but I can tell you that we have lost service. We are doing the best we can to make it work. Frank is telling you that he is doing the best he can to make it work. If it comes to pass and that is what this Board wants we will do the best we can to make it work but we don't think it is a good idea. Thank you.

Mr. Thomas Lolicata stated there are a lot of key words involved here tonight in consolidation because there are a lot of comparisons in Mr. Thomas' correspondence. We are being compared to Nashua. I heard Nashua a lot. We have three times the painting of Nashua. If you went out to bid it would cost you more. The other part is I have read articles about consolidation and the authors allude to four conclusions and these are the four – job duties should be alike or similar in functions, service has got to be maintained, priorities cannot change, long-term results usually cost more money. These are given facts. I am telling you for a City this size with the amount of people that I have I think he has his hands full enough because I know I have and I have lost people and I need more people. Right now all he can do and most people like say snow removal is put it out to bid. He has to take care of all of the parking lots like I do through bid. He has to clear the streets. He wouldn't get to the parking lots until the second or third day. These are services that you are going to lose. It is going to cost more money. We provide services and we work well with the Highway Department as far as painting. One day they will do a whole road and that has to be painted or just the base because of liability. We stop our painting, go take care of it, and go back again. If you are going to put it out to bid you are not going to get a company to do that. You talk about parking management and taking over these lots and all of the snow removal. Believe me parking management is going to charge a pretty fair dollar and I would like to know what parking management company is going to have the equipment to do all of this stuff. I have gone through all of this and I guess the only word I can come up with is I am amazed.

In all honesty I think what we have in the Traffic Department right now and the reason we are is because of how we have grown. We started off and the City grew and we grew because there was so much work. Now there is still more work coming in and we are at a standstill. I believe if we were in the Highway Department, which I already went through by the way in 1994, I lost three or four people when I went under Highway. I asked for people to help us and I was lucky to get one man. Why? Because he needed them. So where are the services? It just doesn't make sense. I am not going to talk for another half an hour on this but I will be very blunt. All four of these zig zag, three out of four I do not agree with, Frank and I think in the long term you are going to lose a lot of money and the most important thing is you are going to lose services to the people. In a lot of other cities and Cambridge is very comparable to Manchester, Traffic is a department of Safety, not a maintenance department but a department of safety and it takes time to teach these men how, when and where to put up a sign and what ordinance and how to run a paint machine and different types of paint machines. This is a learning process. This is a complex job. The parking meters. There are over 2,500 of them. Is that going to be knocked down to one person? You need three people in there at least. We are talking \$4,000 or \$5,000 a day. I am not going to go any further but I think in my findings and in what I am reading on different things as far as this is concerned really I don't think this is going to work.

Alderman Gatsas asked during your budget deliberations with the Mayor was consolidation brought up in any of the Mayor's deliberations in regards to your three departments.

Mr. Lolicata answered no it wasn't.

Alderman Gatsas asked so in this budget process the Mayor never spoke to you about consolidation, restructuring or anything of the sort in this budget cycle.

Mr. Lolicata answered no.

Alderman Gatsas stated Mr. Thomas I agree with you that the President only has one Cabinet but you have to agree that the gentleman who is the Cabinet member for the Department of Education doesn't address questions on Health and Human Services so he may have one Cabinet but he has department heads that have the expertise in those various departments. So I agree with what you are saying that there is one Cabinet but there are an awful lot of department heads within that Cabinet to address vital questions as you go forward. With that said, I guess my question is and I know that the Mayor has spoken that a parking lot is plowed by traffic and the sidewalks are done by Highway and I don't know if Parks is involved in that situation or not but I guess the biggest question is has the Mayor

had the three of you in and said talk to me about the plowing of the City and tell me what the three functions are that you folks do and is there any way that we can get the three of you to sit down and say what are the efficiencies that we can do as a City to save money, to save man hours, to maybe plow the sidewalk next to the parking lot that we are leasing...has any of that ever been done?

Mr. Thomas responded there hasn't been that type of discussion at the Mayor's level, no. I think I touched on that in the proposal that you have a copy of.

Alderman Gatsas stated I understand that but if the gentleman at the top doesn't understand the functions of the three of you beneath it is very difficult...it is easy to throw the word consolidation or restructuring around but if you don't understand if there are synergies that are happening below then you can't make a proper decision from above of what people are doing. You may say it doesn't matter I can't plow those parking lots, we don't have enough people and I am sub-contracting time as it is because I don't have enough people to do the plowing of the streets. I don't know that and maybe that is not a true case but I would assume that there would be conversation that would be happening.

Mr. Thomas replied first of all I agree with you. We haven't had those discussions at the level of the Mayor, however, there are no proposals for the Highway Department to take over the actual operations that Traffic now provides or the operations that the Parks Department provides. Yes, all three of the departments sitting in front of you have some kind of involvement in snow removal. What I tried to note is that there may be some kind of benefit in consolidating the resources of the three departments in the event of say a large storm when we know that school isn't going to be open. I think with some cross training there are maybe some benefits to getting more manpower out on the road and get the road cleared up and then jump into the parking lots or the schools afterwards.

Alderman Gatsas responded that comes back to my first question and my original statement. It is probably more than a question. That if the person at the top doesn't understand the functions of the three of you then it is very difficult to get the three of you together so that you can say yes there is a major snowstorm and this is what we should do. It is almost kind of like setting up at Seabrook an evacuation plan because if you don't have one you are not getting out of there. I think if you don't have a plan on the best way to motivate employees for the City to see the bigger synergy that is one of them. That is the most important issue. To have people to say this is what we can do with the cooperation of departments because I think you all understand that you are all paid by the same taxpayers and I think the services that we allocate to those taxpayers are very important.

Mr. Ludwig stated I have been here almost 30 years and in one time we have been called together that I can remember by our Emergency Operations Officer, which I think is now Chief Kane, to actually say this is an all out blizzard and school will not be open tomorrow and we need every available piece of equipment out there on the streets. I don't know if Mr. Thomas remembers that but I can tell you that over the years as we have reconstructed school grounds and done bus drop offs and tried to take care of safety issues around schools so that children weren't being run over we have created nightmares in terms of how we do snow removal at our school facilities. We have had to adapt and downsize some of our equipment to put it in line to do that kind of operation. So we have a very different plowing operation. Do I have a couple of dumptrucks that Frank could use? I suppose I do but for the majority of the time our equipment is really not street or road worthy. The $\frac{3}{4}$ ton pick-up is not going to last long going up and down Webster Street or any other street. It just isn't going to happen. Nor is it going to push that amount of snow. So the fallacy out there is that there is this huge loss of manpower and time and effort as it relates to duplication of services with plowing. Plowing is about 1/100 of what we do and I am not going to say anymore about it.

Mr. Thomas stated again you can debate these points back and forth. Yes, there was one instance that Ron mentioned. If you remember correctly I said there was a need for cross training. If there was a consolidation that took place and an incident came up as I mentioned you would have to have employees from these other departments cross-trained to be able to plow on City streets. It is not an equipment issue in most cases. It is a labor issue where if you remember last year we had four or five days of snow around Christmas time back to back. My bodies were gone. I needed more bodies. Having a consolidated operation that was cross-trained we would be able to use those bodies. So Ron is correct but again are we here to debate these issues? I think everything that is in my report or that Ron brings up...I can debate his presentation and he can debate my presentation.

Chairman Shea asked Mr. Lolicata are you involved with the plowing at all.

Mr. Lolicata answered I have the parking lots and the garages and that is under the contract. I also help out Fred Rusczek and am taking care of his place up there with the contractor.

Chairman Shea stated I know there was some comment made on the corner of I guess Pine and Concord Street. What is the scenario there?

Mr. Lolicata responded the corner is not going to change and the plowing is not going to change. The person plowing is going to come down Concord Street and go through the parking lot and I will be going through the parking lot.

Chairman Shea asked is there any efficiency if somebody took responsibility for the whole...or can't you do that.

Mr. Lolicata answered if you do he needs bodies first of all. Second of all there are priorities involved. I think Frank would want his streets opened up first. If he borrowed some of my...I haven't got equipment but the contractor who is going to do the lots? There are thousands of people depending on them to go to work everyday.

Chairman Shea stated so it is a matter of when things are done according to timing rather than obviously overlapping.

Mr. Lolicata responded well you want your City cleared out but at the same time you can't do the impossible. You have to concentrate on one area and that is what we do. I don't think Frank has the time or the men to do it.

Alderman Osborne stated as an Alderman in my fourth term over the years Parks, Highway, and Traffic have met a lot to me because I am a constituent Alderman. I know what it is like to call each one of you and to get the actions that I have gotten over the years from you. I really appreciate it. I, myself, don't think you are going to save any money by doing this in the long run. You might save a little at the beginning but in the long run you are not going to save any money and you are going to give a lot more headaches to everybody. Being an Alderman, all of us here, we have to rely on these three departments and if we were to combine all of these three departments under one person and we had to deal with one person and not three, which means there could be a personality conflict between an Alderman and a department head and his services would fall a little below somebody else's. This is politics. We all know it. I believe whole-heartedly that these three departments should stay the way they are and I want to move to receive and file.

Alderman Sysyn duly seconded the motion to receive and file.

Chairman Shea stated I just want to reiterate what Alderman Osborne just said. When I came in I asked Frank Thomas for a certain amount of assistance with a certain project that is going on up in one of my areas of my ward. Then I went to Ron Johnson and explained that I was at a ballgame on Sunday and there were a couple of instances there where changes had to be made. I don't know how many times I have called Tom Lolicata but if I said during the course of being an Alderman I have called him 400 times I would probably not be exaggerating but maybe under estimating because most of the problems that Alderman Osborne and I are confronted with have to do with traffic – big time traffic. Most of the traffic today is in the South end of Manchester and all of the people there are concerned about traffic related situations. I have no problem with the Highway Department.

All of the employees are great there. They know their jobs but so do the other folks. I would tend to agree with my two colleagues here, however, we can open it up for discussion if we so wish.

Alderman Guinta stated I have a couple of quick questions, maybe for Tom and Ron. Is there ever a time when you would be in favor of consolidation just to give some perspective because Ron it seems like this is very personal to you. You read a letter that said the process...I think you called it in your letter bias and there was another word you used. I don't think anybody is trying to do anything here other than trying to maybe change the City for the better. It seems like this is a very heated issue with a lot of people and let's put it into perspective. The goal here is to try to deliver services in a more efficient and effective manner – nothing more and nothing less.

Mr. Lolicata responded it is and I agree with what you are saying with a passion because the people I have and the job that we do in dealing with liability and safety every day to make sure that everything is done right and to me yes, that is how I feel. I need extra people to begin with, Frank. Everything we do is complex up there. This is not just banging a stake in between parking meters. There is a lot involved with this stuff.

Alderman Guinta replied if you are under the impression that was as a Board or I as an Alderman or this Board thinks that any of your jobs are miniscule you are incorrect. We have a lot of respect for what each of you do and what each of you...I think everybody has a lot of respect for the three individuals here and how you run your departments. This is not the Aldermen saying you don't run your department efficiently so we are going to consolidate you. That is not what this is about. What we want to do is research and study if we can provide service better. It sounds like from what you are telling that under no circumstances do you ever think there could be a consolidation to improve services so I want to know if you are being just as bias because of the passions of your department as Ron you cited in the letter that was dated January 4, 2003. Your comments in one of them says, "this consolidation report was prepared in a partial and bias manner." I think we all are partial and we all are bias, whether it is the Mayor, an Alderman, a department head, a resident...it is called an opinion. What we need to try to do is gather the opinions of this Board and determine if we can save people money and be more efficient. No more, no less. I wish maybe we could take the personalities out of this a little bit because it is not about are we going to get rid of Tom or Ron or Frank. It is about delivery of service in a more responsible or efficient or effective manner. That is all it is. I agree with Alderman Osborne. He certainly calls department head quite a bit. He is a constituent minded Alderman but if we consolidate it doesn't mean that he is not going to get an unanswered phone call. It doesn't mean that his issue is not going to be taken care of because there was a

consolidation or reorganization or whatever you want to call it. I don't think that for a second. I guess my point is is there a way that we can look at this...I don't know if there is a way we can look at it in an impartial or unbiased manner.

Mr. Lolicata stated I was agreeing with you. What it comes down to is most of my men have 20-25 years experience. It is the experience that gives the service. Do you follow me? That is what I am trying to show here.

Alderman Guinta asked but how would we be limiting that experience if the three organizations come under one roof.

Mr. Lolicata answered there will be different people going in there and it would be a learning circle.

Alderman Guinta asked what is wrong with that. What is wrong with cross training?

Mr. Lolicata answered as long as you keep getting the same person I think that is good but when it comes to specific jobs you want that person doing the best he can. Say for signals. You want to make sure those two people know their job. You can't just take anybody off the street. When it comes to striping, there is a learning circle there. There are two different machines. It doesn't take one week or two days. It takes months or half a year and to me that experience shows after awhile. I am actually agreeing with you. That is the service that I am trying to show you where experience comes in. That's all.

Chairman Shea stated we have just a few more minutes and I would like to get a consensus here. I am not sure if you.

Alderman Guinta interjected well I certainly hope it is not received and filed.

Chairman Shea stated well each one has their own opinion on the issue so if you don't want to receive and file it, you are welcome to vote that way.

Alderman Lopez stated in lieu of time first of all I am a firm believer as a Charter Commissioner that put this Charter together that this shouldn't even be addressed with the budget regardless that the City attorney has ruled that we can do this. I don't see any deficiencies in the Parks & Recreation or the Traffic Department at this time. I would like to move the motion to receive and file.

Chairman Shea called for a vote. Alderman Lopez called for a roll call vote. Aldermen Lopez, Osborne, Porter, Shea, Sysyn, and DeVries voted yea. Aldermen Gatsas and Garrity voted nay. The motion carried.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Sysyn, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee